

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Official Action mailed July 13, 2004. In order to advance prosecution of the present Application, Claims 1, 12, 17, 26, and 36 have been amended. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this Application.

The drawings stand objected to under 37 C.F.R. §1.84(p)(5) as including reference numerals not mentioned in the specification. The Examiner indicated that reference numeral 23 of FIGURE 1 was not mentioned in Applicant's specification. Reference numeral 23 can be found at page 24, lines 15-21, of Applicant's specification. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the drawings are in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §1.84(p)(5).

The Abstract stands objected to under M.P.E.P. §608.01(b) for various informalities. The Abstract has been amended to address matters raised by the Examiner. Attached herewith for the Examiner's convenience is a clean version of the amended Abstract on a separate sheet. Applicant respectfully submits that the Abstract is in accordance with M.P.E.P. §608.01(b).

Claims 1-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Xu, et al. Independent Claims 1, 12, 17, 26, and 36 recite in general the ability to move a mobile object from a home network to a foreign network in response to unavailable resources at the home network and execute the mobile object on a first virtual machine at a first router on the foreign network. By contrast, the Xu, et al. patent merely provides a capability for a device to communicate with its home network remotely through a foreign network. Thus, the Xu, et al. patent has no concern for moving a mobile object from a home network to a foreign network for execution in response to unavailable resources at the home network as provided in the claimed invention. Support for the above

recitation can be found at page 10, lines 19, to page 11, line 3, of Applicant's specification. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-38 are not anticipated by the Xu, et al. patent.

Applicant notes that the Examiner has not provided an indication that the documents submitted in the Information Disclosure Statement of June 11, 2001 were considered during examination of the Application. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to provide the appropriate indication that th4e documents cited therein have been considered.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other apparent reasons, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all pending Claims.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Attorneys for Applicants

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Charles S. Fish", is written over the printed name.

Charles S. Fish

Reg. No. 35,870

October 18, 2004

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600

Dallas, TX 75201-2980

(214) 953-6507

Customer Number: 05073